



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/660,353

09/11/2003

P. Anders I. Bertelrud

2095.001100/P3126

5128

23720 7590 03/20/2007
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100
HOUSTON, TX 77042

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/20/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/660,353	Applicant(s) BERTELROD ET AL.	
	Examiner Eric B. Kiss	Art Unit 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 14-17, 22-31, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” In this context, “functional descriptive material” consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of “data structure” is “a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions.” The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) “Nonfunctional descriptive material” includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data. Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed

Art Unit: 2192

as descriptive material *per se*. *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1760 (claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory).

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material *per se* and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. *See, e.g., In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1760 (claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings *per se*, *i.e.*, the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. *See In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035.

Claim 16 recites an “apparatus” comprising a series of means that can be reasonably interpreted as software, *per se*. The claim does not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the software elements and a computer that would permit the described functionality to be realized when the software is employed as a computer component. Accordingly, claim 16 appears to merely set forth functional descriptive material *per se*, which is nonstatutory.

A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. To be statutory, a claimed process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation for which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application which produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result. *See Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 183-84, 209 USPQ 1, 9 (1981) (quoting *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) (“A [statutory] process is a mode of treatment of certain materials to produce a given result. It is an act, or a series of acts, performed upon the subject-matter to be transformed and reduced to a different state or thing The process requires that certain things should be done with certain substances, and in a certain order; but the tools to be used in doing this may be of secondary consequence.”). *See also In re Alappat*, 33 F.3d 1526, 1543, 31 USPQ2d 1545, 1556-57 (quoting *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 192, [209 USPQ at 10]).

In *State Street*, the Federal Circuit examined some of its prior section 101 cases, observing that the claimed inventions in those cases were each for a “practical application of an abstract idea” because the elements of the invention operated to produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” *State St. Bank & Trust v. Signature Fin. Group*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1373-74, 47

Art Unit: 2192

USPQ2d 1596, 1601-02 (Fed Cir. 1998). For example, the court in *State Street* noted that the claimed invention in *Alappat* “constituted a practical application of an abstract idea (a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation), because it produced ‘a useful, concrete and tangible result’—the smooth waveform.” *Id.* Similarly, the claimed invention in *Arrhythmia* “constituted a practical application of an abstract idea (a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation), because it corresponded to a useful, concrete and tangible thing—the condition of a patient’s heart.” *Id.* (citing *Arrhythmia Research Tech. V. Corazonix Corp.*, 958 F.2d 1053, 22 USPQ2d 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1992)).

In determining whether the claim is for a “practical application,” the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result is “useful, tangible and concrete.” The Federal Circuit further ruled that it is of little relevance whether a claim is directed to a machine or process for the purpose of a § 101 analysis. *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Commc’ns*, 172 F.3d 1352, 1358, 50 USPQ2d 1447, 1451 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 14-17, 22-31, 36, and 37 are directed to methods (claims 1, 4-7, 24-31, 36, and 37), articles (claims 9, 14, and 15), and apparatuses (claims 16, 17, 22, and 23) for “initiating compilation” and “indicating a status of the compilation”. This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/ phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation,

Art Unit: 2192

or manipulated data. More specifically, the claimed subject matter describes at best the performing of a process that is not tied to any particular tangible output capable of being, for example, stored, displayed, or conveyed in any manner causing any useful functional or structural change in a computer system so as to achieve a practical application. This produced result remains in the abstract and, thus, fails to achieve the required status of having real world value.

5. To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 (non-statutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of Applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "wherein determining that the file has been modified" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, claim 6 is interpreted as being dependent from claim 5, which provides the necessary antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-29 and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,193,191 (McKeeman et al.).

As per claim 1, *McKeeman et al.* discloses:

initiating compilation of a file in a processor-based system in advance of a request from a user to compile the file (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61 (recompilation uses previously compiled code);

detecting the user request to compile the file (see, e.g., *Id.* (recompilation is started); and

indicating a status of the compilation of the file in response to detecting the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 2, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses initiating compilation of the file comprising compiling the file including one or more code segments to produce an object code file (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 30-34).

As per claim 3, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses compiling the file comprising compiling one or more code segments in the file to produce an object code file, and further comprising linking the object code file to produce an executable file (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 37-46).

As per claim 4, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses indicating the status of the compilation of the file comprising at least one of indicating that the compilation was successful and indicating that the compilation was unsuccessful (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34).

As per claim 5, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses initiating compilation of the file comprising compiling the file in response to determining that the file has been modified (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 21-23).

As per claim 6, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses determining that the file has been modified comprising determining that the modified file has been saved to a storage unit (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-23).

As per claim 7, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the file including one or more code segments, [the method] further comprising:

determining that the file has been modified (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-23; col. 13, lines 42-54);

identifying the modified file in a work queue (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61); and

initiating the compilation of the file based on the modified file being identified in the work queue (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 8, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses indicating the status of the compilation of the file comprising generating one or more files associated with the compilation of the file, storing the one or more generated files in a temporary location, and transferring the one or more files from the temporary location to a different location in response to detecting the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 30-34).

Art Unit: 2192

As per claim 9, *McKeeman et al.* discloses an article comprising one or more machine-readable storage media containing instructions (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 6-39) that when executed enable a processor to:

initiate compiling of a file including one or more code segments (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61 (recompilation uses previously compiled code);

detect a user request to compile the file (see, e.g., *Id.* (recompilation is started)); and

provide a result associated with the compiling in response to detecting the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 10, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to display a message to a user indicating that one or more errors were detected during the compiling (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 11, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to indicate to a user that the compiling was successful (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported; if no errors are detected, then object code is produced as input to the linker)).

As per claim 12, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to generate a file containing object code based on compiling the file and to store the object code file in a temporary location (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 30-34).

As per claim 13, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to move the object code file from the temporary location into a product location based on determining that the compiling of the file was successful and in response to detecting

Art Unit: 2192

the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported; if no errors are detected, then object code is produced as input to the linker)).

As per claim 14, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to initiate compiling of the file based on determining that the file was modified (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 15, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to indicate in a work queue that the file has been modified and to initiate compiling of the file in response to detecting the indication (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 16, *McKeeman et al.* discloses an apparatus (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 6-39), comprising:

means for initiating compilation of a file in a processor-based system in advance of a request from a user (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61 (recompilation uses previously compiled code));

means for detecting the user request to compile the file (see, e.g., *Id.* (recompilation is started)); and

means for indicating a status of the compilation of the file in response to detecting the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 17, *McKeeman et al.* discloses an apparatus (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 6-39), comprising:

a storage unit having a file stored therein (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 6-39); and

a control unit communicatively coupled to the storage unit (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 6-39),

the control unit adapted to:

Art Unit: 2192

initiate compilation of the file in advance of a request from a user to compile the file (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61 (recompilation uses previously compiled code));

detect the user request to compile the file (see, e.g., *Id.* (recompilation is started));
and

indicate a status of the compilation of the file in response to detecting the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 18, *McKeeman et al.* discloses the control unit is adapted to compile a file including one or more code segments to produce an object code file (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 30-34).

As per claim 19, *McKeeman et al.* discloses the control unit is adapted to link the object code file to produce an executable file (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 37-46).

As per claim 20, *McKeeman et al.* discloses the control unit is adapted to store the executable file in a temporary location and to transfer the executable file from the temporary location to a different location based on detecting the user request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 30-34).

As per claim 21, *McKeeman et al.* discloses the control unit is adapted to at least one of indicate that the compilation was successful and indicate that the compilation was unsuccessful (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34).

As per claim 22, *McKeeman et al.* discloses the control unit is adapted to compile the file in response to determining that the file has been modified (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-23; col. 13, lines 42-54).

As per claim 23, *McKeeman et al.* discloses the control is adapted to:

Art Unit: 2192

determine that the file has been modified (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-23; col. 13, lines 42-54);

identify the modified file in a work queue (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61); and

initiate the processing of the file based on the modified file being identified in the work queue (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 24, *McKeeman et al.* discloses:

identifying one or more source files that have been modified in a processor-based system (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-23; col. 13, lines 42-54);

initiating processing of at least a portion of the modified source files before receiving a request to process the modified files (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61);

receiving the request to process at least one of the modified files (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61 (recompilation uses previously compiled code)); and

providing a status associated with the processing of the file in response to receiving the request (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 25, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the processor-based system is adapted to execute an integrated development environment module (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 53-56), wherein identifying the one or more files comprises the integrated development environment module placing the one or more of the source files that have been modified in a queue (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 26, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses placing the one or more of the source files in the queue comprises placing at least one source file in the queue in response to a user saving the source file to a storage unit (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-23).

As per claim 27, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses placing the one or more of the source files in the queue comprises placing at least a portion of one source file in the queue in response to a user saving the source file to a storage unit using an editor and then exiting from the editor (see, e.g., col. 17, lines 11-36).

As per claim 28, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses placing the one or more of the source files in the queue comprises placing at least one source file in the queue in response to determining that a user desires to compile at least a portion of the source file as the source file is being edited (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 15-17; col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 29, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses placing the one or more of the source files in the queue comprises placing at least one source file in the queue in response to determining that the source file includes at least one marker identifying a section of the source file that should be compiled, and wherein initiating processing of at least the portion of the one or more modified files comprises compiling the identified section of the source file (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 44-61).

As per claim 31, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses initiating the processing comprises initiating a build process to produce a software application and wherein receiving the request comprises receiving the request to building the software application (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 15-17).

As per claim 32, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses initiating the build process comprises performing compiling the modified source files to produce object code files and linking the object code files to produce executable files (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 37-46).

Art Unit: 2192

As per claim 33, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the object code files and the executable files are stored in a first storage location (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 37-46).

As per claim 34, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses suppressing at least one of an error and warning that is detected while compiling the modified source files (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported)).

As per claim 35, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the object code files and the executable files are moved to a different storage location in response to detecting the request and in response to detecting no error or warning (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 23-34 (errors are detected and reported; if no errors are detected, then object code is produced as input to the linker)).

As per claim 36, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses identifying one or more source files comprises identifying the one or more source files based on a directed acyclic graph (see, e.g., col. 16, 54-63).

As per claim 37, *McKeeman et al.* further discloses the directed acyclic graph includes a list of dependent files, wherein identifying one or more source files comprises identifying at least one modified source file and another source file that is dependent on the modified source file using the directed acyclic graph (see, e.g., col. 16, 54-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2192

11. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,193,191 (McKeeman et al.) in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2005/0108682 (Piehler et al.).

As per claim 30, *McKeeman et al.* discloses such a method (see the rejection of claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)) but fails to expressly disclose initiating the processing of the modified source files comprises causing a background thread to awaken in response to placing the one or more of the source files in the queue, where the background thread thereafter initiates processing of the source files. However, *Piehler et al.* teaches such use of a background thread to enqueue a task for itself to complete the rest of the compilation in a background thread as part of a response to a new file being added to a project or an existing file being modified (*Piehler et al.* at paragraphs [0170] through [0180]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include such background thread use as per the teachings of *Piehler et al.* One would be motivated to do so to gain the advantage of providing immediate feedback to the user without any detectable visible delay in typing responsiveness while the compiler finishes processing the change (*Piehler et al.* at paragraph [0174]).

Conclusion

12. prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (571) 272-3699. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:00 am - 4:30 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

Art Unit: 2192

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.



Eric B. Kiss
March 16, 2007